
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2020

by Stephen Wilkinson BA BPI Dip LA MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3244006

89 Heather Lane, Yiewsley, West Drayton UB7 8AP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs J Miah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 146/APP/2019/3123, dated 17 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the date of the Council's decision to refuse the application for planning permission for this development it has withdrawn the Local Plan Part 2 Saved Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Policies (2012) and the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS – Residential Layouts and Residential Extensions. Accordingly, for the purposes of this appeal it relies on policies BE1 of Part 1 of the (UDP 2012) and policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Development Management Policies (2020). Furthermore, it relies on policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan 2016. I wrote to the appellant informing them of these changes but they have not made any further representations. My assessment of the appeal has been made against these new policies.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises the side garden area of a semi-detached two storey residential property located at the prominent junction of Heather Lane with Gorse Walk. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character with a range of building types, although a common feature of the area is its openness with buildings set well back from their frontages. This a particular aspect of this junction given the set back of 71-87 Heather Lane on the opposite side of Gorse Lane.
5. The proposed dwelling includes features such as its 'set back' from the frontage of its 'parent' property and from its flank to Gorse Lane, the inclusion of a bay

window and a hipped roof. However, the net effect of the proposals is to create a terrace of 3 properties which is marked by its roof design which contrasts with the gables of the semi-detached properties of resulting in a discordant feature within the street scene.

6. Whilst the effect of the proposal would be noticeable on Heather Lane where the proposal would imbalance the pair of semi-detached properties and the hipped gable would adversely contrast with the gable of other semi-detached properties along this stretch of road, the proposed extension would be clearly visible from along Gorse Walk where properties have a strong building line. Furthermore, the net effect of the appeal scheme would be to encroach on the open character of the junction at this point and imbalance views from along Gorse Walk. This would be to the detriment of the open character of the area.
7. The appellant cites an appeal decision¹ on a site which lies at the junction of The Thicket and Heather Lane where a proposal for a single dwelling as an extension to an existing pair of semi-detached properties was allowed. As I do not have the full details of this case and the circumstances of every appeal are different I am unable to comment on this decision. The appellant identifies other sites where development has been built on the edge of frontages in the vicinity of the appeal site. These can be distinguished from the appeal site because they were designed as terraces. Their context does not enjoy the same degree of openness as the appeal site. Other extensions to residential properties in the area, identified by the appellants, do not occupy such prominent locations as the appeal site.
8. I acknowledge that the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, (the Framework) recognises the importance of small sites in the provision of housing and that the proposals would result in an additional dwelling that could meet the Council's housing targets. However, set against this I consider that the adverse impacts of the scheme on the character and appearance of the area outweigh the benefits of an additional dwelling on this site.
9. I conclude on this main issue that the proposals would result in harm to the character and appearance of the local area contrary to policies BE1 of the Part 1 of the UDP, which promotes high quality design, which respects local character and policies DMHB 11 which require that new development is designed to the highest standards requiring that it harmonises with its local context. Furthermore, the proposals are contrary to DMHD1 which requires, amongst other matters, that the width of extensions should not exceed over half the width of the parent property. The proposals would not comply with policies which seek the high quality in housing design of policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan 2016 which require new development to respond to the pattern and grain of existing spaces and streets. Furthermore, the proposals does not comply with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 which seeks to achieve well designed places with a high standard of amenity. For these reasons the appeal is dismissed.

Stephen Wilkinson

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/R5510/W/18/3193125